

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:

Assistant Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, D.C. 20231

On 12/18/98

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP

By: [Signature]



PATENT  
Attorney Docket No.: 23070-689-3  
Client Reference No.: 96-185-4

Handwritten notes and signatures: #12, [Signature], 1-7-99

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

In re application of:

GRAY et al.

Application No.: 08/892,695

Filed: July 15, 1997

For: GENES FROM THE 20Q13  
AMPLICON AND THEIR USES

Examiner: Unger, S.

Art Unit: 1642

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION  
REQUIREMENT

Assistant Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, D.C. 20231

Sir:

The following is offered in response to the Office Action mailed November 18, 1998. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

**REMARKS**

Applicants note with appreciation that the restriction requirements of the Office Action mailed May 27, 1998 have been withdrawn, presumably in response to the traversal in applicants response mailed August 26, 1998. In response to the present restriction, applicants hereby elect with traverse to prosecute the claims of Group II (claims 26-41), directed to methods of screening for neoplastic cells and detecting mutations using nucleic acid probes of the invention. In response to the species election, applicants elect sequences that hybridize to SEQ ID NO:9. Applicants note, however, that SEQ ID Nos 9 and 10 are related in that SEQ




ID NO:9 is the genomic sequence of ZABC1 and SEQ ID NO:10 is the open reading frame for that gene. Thus, it is respectfully requested that these two species be examined together.

According to the MPEP, where claims can be examined together without undue burden, the Examiner must examine the claims on the merits even though they are directed to independent and distinct inventions. *See*, the MPEP at 803.01. In establishing that an "undue burden" would exist for co-examination of claims, the Examiner must show that examination of the claims would involve substantially different prior art searches, making the co-examination burdensome. To show undue burden resulting from searching difficulties, the Examiner must show that the restricted groups have a separate classification, acquired a separate status in the art, or that searching would require different fields of search (MPEP at § 808.02). Applicants submit that no undue burden exists in examining all the claims of the present application and therefore respectfully request that the restriction should be withdrawn.

If a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (415) 576-0200.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Kevin Bastian  
Reg/No. 34,774

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP  
Two Embarcadero Center, 8<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, California 94111-3834  
Tel: (415) 576-0200  
Fax: (415) 576-0300

KLB  
SF 182739 v1